STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

2029 Century Park East

Los Angeles, California 90067-3086

24

25

26

27 28

SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)

LA 51201709v1

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

Roth Capital Partners, LLC ("Roth") opposes Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Re: Negative Causation (the "Motion"). Plaintiffs' Motion fundamentally is an opposition to the expert report and deposition testimony of the auditors' damages and loss causation expert, Christopher James. (Pls. Mot. at 13.) ("Plaintiffs will address primarily the arguments of PwC, E&Y, and James as to their theory of causation.") The Motion refers to Roth's damages and loss causation expert, Larry Y. Dann, Ph.D., only in passing. These sporadic references to Professor Dann in plaintiffs' Motion are amply rebutted in Roth's concurrently-filed Opposition to plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Professor Dann.

Moreover, and fatally for their Motion, plaintiffs incorrectly state the standard for loss causation (i.e., negative causation) under Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933. Plaintiffs erroneously assert that in order to establish a loss causation defense, a defendant must prove that "all of a plaintiff's losses stemmed from matters unrelated to the misstatements." (Pls. Mot. at 1; see also Id. at 8, in order "to prevail on their negative-causation defense, Defendants' proof must totally eliminate their alleged misstatement as a contributing cause to Plaintiffs' losses." (emphasis added).) Plaintiffs further and equally erroneously contend that since defendants failed to establish a "total disconnection between Defendants' misstatements and Plaintiffs' losses," the Court should grant summary judgment "dismissing" defendants' loss causation defense and "bar[ring] Defendants from raising this affirmative defense at trial." (Id. at 2, 9.) Plaintiffs' assertions are contradicted by the plain language of Section 11(e), which provides:

[I]f the defendant proves that <u>any portion</u> or all of such damages represents other than the depreciation in value of such security resulting from such part of the registration statement, with respect to which his liability is asserted, not being true or omitting to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, such portion of or all such damages shall not be recoverable.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

28

1

2

3

4

5

	15 U.S.C. § 77k(e) (emphasis added); see also Alaska Electrical Pension Fund v.
	Flowserve Corp., 572 F.3d. 221, 233 (5th Cir. 2009) (under Section 11(e) defendants
-	are entitled to a reduction in damages "for so much of the loss as is not attributable to
	the misstatement" (emphasis added)); see also Akerman v. Oryx Communications,
	Inc., 810 F.2d 336, 340 (2d Cir. 1987) ("A defendant may, under section 11(e),
	reduce his liability by proving that the depreciation in value resulted from factors
	other than the material misstatement in the registration statement" (emphasis added))
	Not surprisingly, plaintiffs have not cited a single case where a court has precluded
	defendants from asserting a loss causation defense at trial. Even assuming,
	arguendo, defendants are not entitled to summary judgment on the grounds that
	plaintiffs' losses are not completely unrelated to the alleged misstatements, there is
	absolutely no authority for plaintiffs' contention that defendants cannot assert a loss
	causation defense at trial and prove that 99.99% (or some other percentage) of
	plaintiffs' losses were caused by factors unrelated to the alleged misstatements.
	For the foregoing reasons, Roth respectfully requests that the Court deny

For the foregoing reasons, Roth respectfully requests that the Court deny plaintiffs' Motion seeking to bar defendants from raising the defense of loss causation at trial.

October 30, 2009

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

By: /s/ Mary D. Manesis

MARY D. MANESIS, *Pro Hac Vice*2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: 310-556-5800
Facsimile: 310-556-5959

Email: mmanesis@stroock.com

Attorneys for Defendant Roth Capital Partners, LLC

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

(Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)

9

Los Angeles, California 90067-3086

2029 Century Park East

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

A 51201709v1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 30, 2009 I electronically filed the foregoing document described as: ROTH CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT RE: LOSS CAUSATION with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record on the CM/ECF for this litigation.

> /s/ Mary D. Manesis Mary D. Manesis

(Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)

2

3

4

5

6

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP Los Angeles, California 90067-3086

CERTIFICATE	OF	SERV	ICE
--------------------	-----------	------	------------

I hereby certify that on October 30, 2009 I electronically filed the foregoing document described as:

ROTH CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT RE: LOSS CAUSATION

I electronically filed this document with the Clerk of the Court using the M/ECE system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

7	7 CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:		
8	George S Azadian	gazadian@stroock.com,cdusi@stroock.com	
9	James K Barbee	jim@golbeckroth.com	
10	Philip S Beck	anne.doyle@bartlit-beck.com, susan.dandrea@bartlit-beck.com	
11	Daniel II Danier etchi	•	
12	Ronald L Berenstain	rberenstain@perkinscoie.com, jstarr@perkinscoie.com	
13	Steve W Berman	steve@hbsslaw.com,heatherw@hbsslaw.com,carrie@hbsslaw.com	
14	A 1' YZ'11 TO 1 '		
15	Alison Killen Blair	ablair@orrick.com	
16	Brian D Buckley	bbuckley@fenwick.com,kroth@fenwick.com, doconnor@fenwick.com	
17	Elizabeth J Cabraser	ecabraser@lchb.com	
18 19	Kelly P Corr	kcorr@corrcronin.com,dpatterson@corrcronin.com reception@corrcronin.com	
20	James P Cusick	jcusick@orrick.com	
20	Christopher G Emch	emchc@foster.com,pateb@foster.com	
22	Timothy J Filer	filet@foster.com,howej@foster.com	
23	Erin K Flory	erin@hbsslaw.com,jon@hbsslaw.com	
24	Steven Fogg	sfogg@corrcronin.com,hpowell@corrcronin.com	
	Brian C. Frontino	bfrontino@stroock.com,lacalendar@stroock.com	
2526	E Joseph Giometti	jgiometti@orrick.com,jcopoulos@orrick.com, pbenetz@orrick.com	

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

(Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1800 Los Angeles, CA 90067 (310) 556-5800

27

28

1	Peter Jennings Grabicki	pjg@randanco.com,nlg@randanco.com, scc@randanco.com
2	Gary I Grenley	ggrenley@grebb.com
3	Richard M Heimann	rheimann@lchb.com,lsimms@lchb.com
4	Kenneth P Herzinger	kherzinger@orrick.com
5	David D Hoff	dhoff@tousley.com,btaylor@tousley.com
6	Lester C Houtz	
7	Desici C Houtz	lester.houtz@bartlit-beck.com, anne.doyle@bartlit-beck.com
8	James E Howard	howard.james@dorsey.com, summers.shawn@dorsey.com, hall.michelle@dorsey.com
9		hall.michelle@dorsey.com
10	John M Hughes	john.hughes@bartlit-beck.com
11	Bradley B Jones	bjones@gth-law.com, sthomas@gth-law.com,glane@gth-law.com
12	Stellman Keehnel	stellman.keehnel@dlapiper.com, nina.marie@dlapiper.com
13		
14	Kenneth G Kieffer	kkieffer@gth-law.com,lhoober@gth-law.com
15	James Bernard King	jking@ecl-law.com,kschulman@ecl-law.com
16	Christopher D Landgraff	chris.landgraff@bartlit-beck.com
17	Christopher Lind	chris.lind@bartlit-beck.com, anne.doyle@bartlit-beck.com
18	Mary D Manesis	mmanesis@stroock.com,cdusi@stroock.com
19	J. Scott McBride	scott.mcbride@bartlit-beck.com
20	James P McNeill, III	mcnej@foster.com
21	Jeffrey S Miller	milje@foster.com,kellie@foster.com, hickc@foster.com, snydd@foster.com
22		
23	Meredith Moss	mmoss@orrick.com
24	John Degnan Munding	munding@crumb-munding.com, brittany@crumb-munding.com
25	Robert J Nelson	rnelson@lchb.com
26	Kevin Daniel O'Rourke	kevin@southwellorourke.com
27		
28		

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)

11	
Carl Joseph Oreskovich	carl@ettermcmahon.com, roni@ettermcmahon.com
Andrew K Polovin	andrew.polovin@bartlit- beck.com,anne.doyle@bartlit-beck.com
Mark Roth	mark@golbeckroth.com
Stephen Michael Rummage	steverummage@dwt.com,jeannecadley@dwt.com
Darrell W Scott	scottgroup@mac.com,ssimatos@mac.com
F Mike Shaffer	fshaffer@gth-law.com,ksnyder@gth-law.com
James M Shaker	shaker@ryanlaw.com,callahan@ryanlaw.com
Daniel F Shea	dfshea@hhlaw.com
Kim D Stephens	kstephens@tousley.com,bkinsey@tousley.com
Julia B Strickland	jstrickland@stroock.com,lacalendar@stroock.com,tmitchell@stroock.com
Michael S Strube	sstrube@orrick.com,gjohnson@orrick.com
Earl M Sutherland	esutherland@rmlaw.com,jlading@rmlaw.com
Paul H Trinchero	ptrinchero@grebb.com
Fabrice Vincent	fvincent@lchb.com,dclevenger@lchb.com
Leslie Richard Weatherhead	lwlibertas@aol.com,emilyr@wkdtlaw.com, janetj@wkdtlaw.com
Tyler S Weaver	tyler@hbsslaw.com,jeniphr@hbsslaw.com,bonney m@hbsslaw.com
Diana Lynn Weiss	dweiss@orrick.com
Charles S Wright	charleswright@dwt.com,terriray@dwt.com
	/s/ Mary D. Manesis
	Mary D. Manesis
II .	

ROTH'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Case No. CV-04-0025-FVS)